

Analysis

By PHILIP POTTER

(Washington Bureau of The Sun)

Washington, March 17—President Johnson, in his address Monday night to the joint session of Congress, spoke out against "the unity that stifles protest."

He was addressing himself to the civil rights demonstrations in Selma and elsewhere, but his words took in a broader arena.

"In Selma as elsewhere," the President said, "we seek and pray for peace. We seek order. We seek unity. But we will not accept the peace of stifled rights, or the order imposed by fear, or the unity that stifles protest. For peace cannot be purchased at the cost of liberty."

Seeks Support

If there are those in the Senate and House or elsewhere in the country who feel American policy in Vietnam is wrong and have alternatives to present, forums are not lacking.

It is quite true that the President, as is his right, has endeavored to muster support for his policy by calling the legislators to the White House for extensive briefings by himself, Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; Robert S. McNamara, Defense Secretary, and others on the situation in Vietnam and the aims and purposes of American policy there.

The purposes of these meetings, which the President regards as the nearest thing in American history to emulation of the British parliamentary system, is not, he says, to put a stop to debate on Vietnam, but to furnish the potential debaters with as much material as possible to make their debate informed.

Groups Of 40 To 100

The members of Congress have been brought in in groups of from 40 to 100 and all have been invited to ask questions of the President and his Cabinet and staff aides. Each of the sessions has lasted about two hours and, in all, the President and his staff have exposed themselves to 21 hours of give-and-take exchange. Those unable to accept their

original invitations were reinvited for another session. Of the 433 House members and 100 senators, only 14 have passed up the opportunity or been unable to participate.

At these sessions, the President has made it plain that he neither wishes nor expects members of Congress to refrain from debate on his policies.

It is thus difficult to credit those who would have the country believe Mr. Johnson has made a studied effort to tie congressional tongues.

One such is Sanford Gottlieb, Washington representative of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy, who has made speeches here and there suggesting that congressional debate on Vietnam is being squelched by the President. He named Senator Nelson (D., Wis.) as one whose lips have been sealed. Nelson and his aides deny it.

Contention On GOP

It is Gottlieb's contention that only the Republicans are speaking out and that they are doing so in support of the President in order to whipsaw him later with an accusation of appeasement if the course the United States is pursuing in Vietnam leads to negotiations and with a charge of "Johnson's War" if it leads to further conflict.

One group which has no intention of resigning the floor to the Republicans is the Americans for Democratic Action, of which Vice President Humphrey remains a member although he resigned his vice presidency in the organization upon being made Democratic nominee for the country's second highest post.

The organization is taking to heart a plea by J. Kenneth Galbraith, economist who served the late President Kennedy as Ambassador to India, for "more plain speaking by liberals" on American foreign policy, and especially the policy in Vietnam.

"Nostalgia For Past Error"

Foreign policy, he told the annual convention of the National Farmers Union in Chicago today, is "a favored field for those who have a nostalgia for past error. This does not serve a Pres-

ident. He needs to hear just as eloquently from those who speak for reason as he hears from the partisans of the big stick and those who would rather save 5 cents on foreign aid than \$50 on the military budget."

The March issue of the A.D.A. World, out today, has bluntly urged that the United States "cease immediately" bombings of North Vietnam, make a worldwide call for a cease-fire there, announce a willingness to negotiate and immediately call for an emergency meeting of the Security Council of the United Nations, with this body, in turn, authorized to call in all interested parties for discussions with a view to arranging for a neutral Vietnam, guaranteed by the major powers, with a United Nations presence to police the area.

As the A.D.A. sees it, there are three main questions before the country: Does America have the capacity to carry out the commitments it seems to be making? Does it know the consequences of its acts? Is it willing to pay the enormous price of a possible elementary miscalculation?

It sees three schools of thought in contention:

1. Advocates of preventive war (against mainland China).
2. A strong, intelligent and influential group which contends America's aim is negotiated settlement, but force must necessarily be used to achieve it and it must be an American settlement.
3. Those urging negotiated settlement of the entire former Indo-China area by "aggressive multilateral diplomatic and political initiative."

It apparently regards President Johnson as in Group 2 and claims Walter Lippmann, and Democratic Senators Fulbright (Ark.), Mansfield (Mont.) and Church (Idaho) are in Group 3, a placement some of the senators might dispute.